



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,197	09/24/2003	You-Jun Hsieh	2450-0543P	4111

2292 7590 08/30/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

CHOW, DOON Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,197	HSIEH, YOU-JUN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis-Doon Chow	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in view of Ozolins (US 2004/0100447).

Regarding to claim 1, the admitted prior art discloses displaying host operating conditions to display information including temperature of a central processing unit (CPU) of a computer and rotation speed of a radiator fan (page 1, line 9 to page 3, line 7) on a display terminal or on a display device located on a panel of the computer.

The applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose mounting the display device on a keyboard.

Ozolins, in the same display art, discloses a standard keyboard having a plurality of button keys for entering digital data; a keyboard micro-control unit (400, Fig. 4) for generating digital codes corresponding to each of the button keys and transferring the digital codes to a host which connects (423, Fig. 4) to the keyboard, and receiving information signals from the host; a display device ([0016], [0025]) located on an input operation side of the keyboard; and a display micro-control unit (412, Fig. 4) for actuating the display device to display input information and information from the host.

In light of Ozolins, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Ozolins' keyboard display to display the host operating conditions of the admitted prior art so that the host operating conditions can be seen while a user is using the keyboard.

Regarding to claim 2, Ozolins further discloses the display device is a liquid crystal screen [0015]

Regarding to claim 3, Ozolins further discloses display device is a light emitting diode display device [0025].

Regarding to claim 12, Ozolins does not explicitly disclose the display device is centrally located adjacent an upper edge of the keyboard. However, it is considered a matter of design choice to shift the location of Ozolins' display device to centrally located adjacent an upper edge of the keyboard because there is no invention in shifting the location of the display device on the surface of the keyboard. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

3. Claims 4-7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art and Ozolins as applied to claims 1-3 and 12 above, and further in view of Levin et al. (US 2004/0100440).

Regarding to claims 4 and 6, the applicant's prior art does not disclose a rotation speed regulator for generating a signal to control the rotation speed of the radiator fan.

Levin discloses a control panel comprising a rotation speed regulator/knob [0039] for generating a signal to control the rotation speed of a fan [0039].

In light of Levin, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to use Levin's speed regulator/knob in the keyboard of the modified applicant's admitted prior art to control the rotation speed of the radiator fan.

Regarding to claims 5, 7, and 13, Levin does not disclose the speed regulator is a push button or a multistage toggle switch. However, it is well known in the art to a push button or a multistage toggle switch as the speed regulator. Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to use the known push button or multistage toggle switch as the speed regulator in the modified applicant's admitted prior art because the push button and multistage toggle switch occupy less space compare to the turning knob. With regard to 13, it is considered a matter of design choice to shift the location of the button adjacent the display device on the surface of the keyboard because there is no invention in shifting the location of the button. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

4. Claims 8-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant admitted prior art and Ozolins as applied to claims 1-3 and 12 above, and further in view of Venkidu et al. (5623274).

Regarding to claims 8-9 and 14 applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose an alarm unit.

Venkidu, in the same display field, discloses the display device comprising an alarm unit for generating a visual alarm signal when the temperature of a CPU rises or exceeds a present temperature (col. 5, lines 1-6). With regarding to claim 14, it is considered a matter of design choice to shift the location the alarm unit adjacent the button on the surface of the keyboard because there is no invention in shifting the location of the alarm unit. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

In light of Venkidu, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Venkidu's alarm unit in the keyboard display of the modified applicant's admitted prior art so that an alarm signal can be generated when the temperature of the host rises or exceeds a present temperature.

Regarding to claims 10-11, Venkidu does not disclose generating the alarm signal is an audio signal. However, it is well known in the art to generating an audio alarm signal. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the audio means in the keyboard display of the modified applicant's admitted prior art to generate an audio alarm signal so that a person with a visual problem can hear the alarm signal.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 6/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant separately argues each individual reference that they don't teach the claim limitations. The examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments because applicant

Art Unit: 2629


cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually whereas here the rejections are based on combination of references. In re Keller, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis-Doon Chow whose telephone number is 571-272-7767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Dennis-Doon Chow
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2677

D. Chow
March 18, 2006